PATENT

C. REMARKS

1.   Status of the Claims

Claims 1-20 are current present in the Application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 8, and 14 are independent claims. No claims have been amended, cancelled, or added in this Response.

2.   Examiner Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the telephonic interview conducted between Applicants' undersigned attorney and the Examiner. Applicants also note the presence of a Primary Examiner in the interview. During the interview, Applicants' attorney explained why the sole 102 reference relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting Applicants' claims does not teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention. Discussion of Applicants' use of "excluding" records was also conducted.

3.   Drawings

Applicants note that the Examiner did not indicate whether the formal drawings, filed by Applicants with the Application, are accepted by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate whether the drawings are accepted.

4.   Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Cafolla et al. in Oracle Human Resources North American User's Guide, Release 11, Vol. 1, March 1998 (hereinafter "Cafolla"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Docket No. AUS9-2001-0237-US1   Page 10 of 14   Atty Ref. No. IBM-1031
                                    Calderaro, et. al.
                                      09/895,891

PAGE 13/17 * RCVD AT 3/11/2004 1:10:56 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:5123016742 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-18

PATENT

The Cafolla is an extensive, 908 page, user manual of a human resources system. Despite the reference's length, however, it is clear that Cafolla does not teach or suggest Applicants' claimed invention.

Each of the limitations included in the independent claims was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over Cafolla. A claim in anticipated under § 102 only if each and every element of the claim is found, either expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131 states, in part:

> **TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CLAIM**
>
> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California,* 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). >"When a claim covers several structures or compositions, either generically or as alternatives, the claim is deemed anticipated if any of the structures or compositions within the scope of the claim is known in the prior art." *Brown v. 3M,* 265 F.3d 1349, 1351, 60 USPQ2d 1375, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (claim to a system for setting a computer clock to an offset time to address the Year 2000 (Y2K) problem, applicable to records with year date data in "at least one of two-digit, three-digit, or four-digit" representations, was held anticipated by a system that offsets year dates in only two-digit formats). See also MPEP § 2131.02.< "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.,* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond,* 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Note that, in some circumstances, it is permissible to use multiple references in a **35 U.S.C. 102** rejection. See **MPEP § 2131.01.**

As described in further detail below, Cafolla falls far short of teaching each and every element of Applicants'

Docket No. AUS9-2001-0237-US1   Page 11 of 14   Atty Ref. No. IBM-1031
                                     Calderaro, et. al.
                                     09/895,891

PATENT

independent claims.   Comparing Applicants' claim limitations with the sections of Cafolla cited in the Office Action make this amply clear.

Each of Applicants' independent claims include the limitations of selectively displaying employee profiles comprising the steps of:

>   selecting one or more employees to exclude from a first view, the first view including employee profile information corresponding to a plurality of employees;
>
>   excluding the employee profile information corresponding to the selected information from the first view, the exclusion resulting in a second view; and
>
>   granting view access to the second view to one or more of the selected employees.

Regarding the first limitation, "selecting one or more employees to exclude from a first view, the first view including employee profile information corresponding to a plurality of employees," the Office Action asserts that Cafolla teaches "by using people folder as the first view to find people of interest and then using inquiry window as the second view to show specific information about person(s)" citing Cafolla, page 13-2, lines 8-12. However, the cited section of Cafolla simply allows a user to select a viewed person in order to view more information about the selected person. Importantly, Cafolla does not teach or suggest selecting people from a first view to _exclude from_ a second view.

Regarding Applicants' second limitation, "excluding the employee profile information corresponding to the selected information from the first view, the exclusion resulting in a second view," the Office Action states the following:

Docket No. AUS9-2001-0237-US1   Page 12 of 14   Atty Ref. No. IBM-1031
                                    Calderaro, et. al.
                                       09/895,891

PAGE 15/17 * RCVD AT 3/11/2004 1:10:56 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:5123018742 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-18

"Note: by customizing People Folder window to include "Display check box" as one displaying column (Page 8-8, lines 8-10) for the first view, and then drill down of the view and check the box(es) for person(s) to be excluded."

Pages 8-8 and 13-3 of Cafolla is simply allowing a user to select certain fields regarding a particular employee to be displayed in a second view. However, Cafolla is not teaching or suggesting the exclusion of selected employee records from the second view.

Regarding the third limitation of the independent claims, "granting view access to the second view to one or more of the selected employees," Cafolla does not teach or suggest this limitation. The Office Action mistakenly asserts that Cafolla does teach this limitation at Page 34-15 at the paragraph beginning with "ROLEGEN." While the ROLEGEN paragraph of Cafolla does teach granting database permissions, it does not teach that permissions are granted to any views that resulted from selecting employees to exclude from such views. Moreover, this section of Cafolla does not teach or suggest granting permission of such views to "the selected employees," as claimed by Applicants. Note that in Applicants' claims, the "selected employees" are the employees whose information has been excluded from the second view. Furthermore, Cafolla is not teaching or suggesting the performance of an "exclude" function prior to granting permissions to the tables.

In short, Cafolla completely fails to teach or suggest **any** of the limitations set forth in Applicants' independent claims. In order for Applicants' claims to be anticipated, **each and every element** of Applicants' claims must be found in the Cafolla reference. Because of Cafolla's complete failure to teach any of Applicants' claimed limitations, using the Cafolla reference

Docket No. AUS9-2001-0237-US1   Page 13 of 14   Atty Ref. No. IBM-1031
                                        Calderaro, et. al.
                                          09/895,891

PATENT

in a subsequent rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 would likely be improper as there would likely be no reason (motivation) for the references to be combined without the use of impermissible hindsight using Applicants' claims as guideposts.

As set forth above, the rejection of Applicants' independent claims 1, 8, and 14 has been traversed. Claims 2-7, 9-13, and 15-20 depend, directly or indirectly, on claims 1, 8, and 14, respectively. Therefore, claims 2-7, 9-13, and 15-20 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims are allowable. **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Joseph T. Van Leeuwen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,383
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742

Docket No. AUS9-2001-0237-US1   Page 14 of 14   Atty Ref. No. IBM-1031
Calderaro, et. al.
09/895,891

PAGE 17/17 * RCVD AT 3/11/2004 1:10:56 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/4 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:5123016742 * DURATION (mm-ss):05-18